

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/978,455	Applicant(s) LAMANSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner Marie R. Yamnitzky	Art Unit 1774	#15

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marie R. Yamnitzky.

(3) Christopher Glynn.

(2) Kevin Godlewski.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 November 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 31,35,37 and 47.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

See Continuation Sheet
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed the definition of X as set forth in claims 35 and 47 of the proposed after final amendment versus as shown in Replacement Fig. 6b. Applicants' representative explained that the structure containing X has a resonance structure and the definition of X in the claims is correct. It was also noted that the definition of X in the proposed amended claims is the same as in the original claims and original Fig. 6b.

A corrected Fig. 6b is required in order to correct the definition of X in the figure.

Discussed errors introduced into claims 31, 37 and 47 by the proposed after final amendment. Applicants' representative authorized an examiner's amendment to claims 31, 37 and 47 in order to put the application in condition for allowance. See the amendment for the specific changes.

Applicants need not provide a statement of the substance of this interview.



MARIE YAMNITZKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1774

C